

RÆSTAD et al
Serial No. 09/655,871

Atty Dkt: 3842-3
Art Unit: 2134

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants now supplement the remarks of the June 10, 2004 Amendment with the following:

Neither U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus nor U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al are believed to provide any basis for rejecting the new claims 7 – 22 which were added by the June 10, 2004 Amendment.

As pointed out previously with respect to claims 1 – 6, and now reiterated with respect to claims 7 – 22, U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus does not recognize the existence of different versions of the H.323 standard, nor does it in any way address the consequences and ramifications of moving from H.323 V1 standard to the H.323 V2 standard. Nor does U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus address implementation of the H.235 for authentication of end-points operating with a network on end-points of "older" types that still operate according to the H323 V1 standard without H.235 support.

Not only does U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus not address the problems solved by Applicant, but Naudus also may be understood to teach away from the claimed subject matter by employment of a separate authentication/authorization server 26 located in the network. Naudus' server 26 is not involved in any of the activities related to the exchange of H.323 RAS messages. Contrary to Applicants' technique, the Naudus authentication/authorization server 26 exclusively communicates with the end-point represented by the local gateway 40. By contrast, Applicants' authentication proxy communicates with both the end-points and the gatekeeper, by using the appropriate H.323 version and/or H.235 towards the gatekeeper and a different protocol towards the n-point.

RÆSTAD et al
Serial No. 09/655,871

Atty Dkt: 3842-3
Art Unit: 2134

Limitations in Applicants' new independent claim 7 and 15 concerning authentication proxy communication, not taught or suggested by the applied references, include the following:

obtaining from the end-point of the end-user, by using a second protocol different from said first protocol, authentication data comprising an end-user password and an end-point network location specification,

generating a first H.323 RAS (Registration, Admission and Signaling) message using said first protocol....,

transmitting said first H.323 RAS message to the Gatekeeper,

receiving a second H.323 RAS message from the Gatekeeper in response to said first H.323 RAS message...

generating and sending to said end-point, on detection of said confirmation or rejection of said authentication request, an authentication confirm or reject message, respectively, using the second protocol.

Naudus discloses H.323 RAS message exchange between the end-point (represented by the local gateway 40) and the gatekeeper 42, without expressing any concerns whatsoever with regard to an authentication problem that will be encountered in a network where the end-points and the gatekeeper operate with the different versions of the H.323 standard. However, such problem will not be deemed relevant to Naudus, Naudus employs a totally separate authentication/authorization server, and thereby provide an altogether different scheme for authentication, i.e., a scheme has no substantial similarities with the claimed subject matter of all claims, including new claims 7 - 22.

U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al comprises more than 300 pages of drawings and written disclosure. In a searchable format, U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al has 83 different occurrences of the terms "authenticate" and

RÆSTAD et al
Serial No. 09/655,871

Atty Dkt: 3842-3
Art Unit: 2134

"authentication", and variants thereof. Through the applicant's analysis of these 83 occurrences of terms related to authentication, the applicant has not been able to identify a disclosure that may be considered relevant in respect to the claimed subject matter.

In the above regard, U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al includes several references to the use of an authentication server (exemplified by a RADIUS or Keystone server), and other embedded authentication solutions being part of such network elements such as an Internet access device or a voice authentication server. Yet on the other hand, nowhere does the disclosure of the 525 patent refer to a solution that includes an authentication proxy that addresses the incompatibility problem encountered with different versions of the H.323 or authentication by way of H.235 as claimed in any of applicants' claims, including new claims 7 - 22. In fact, U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al does not provide any details at all with regard to possible means or methods that may be related to the authentication specifics in a H.323 network.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, the Examiner has ample bases for withdrawing all rejections and for allowance of all pending claims. Accordingly, a formal indication of allowance is earnestly solicited.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

RÆSTAD et al
Serial No. 09/655,871

Atty Dkt: 3842-3
Art Unit: 2134

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: H. Warren Burnam, Jr.

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100